

Appl. No. : 10/684,313  
Filed : October 13, 2003

### AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

On page 2 of the specification, please revise paragraph 0006 as follows:

[0006] The present invention addresses this problem by providing a system for identifying the relative category preferences [[of]] or affinities of users. In a preferred embodiment, the system includes a hierarchical browse structure or "browse tree" in which items are arranged within a hierarchy of item categories. As a user navigates the browse tree, the user's activity is monitored and recorded in a database to create a user-specific item selection history. The item selection history may also reflect item selections made outside the browse tree (e.g., selection of an item on a search results page). Item selection histories may be maintained for some or all users of the system.

Appl. No. : 10/684,313  
Filed : October 13, 2003

### SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

On June 6, 2006, Applicant's representative, David G. Jankowski, conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Gortayo and Primary Examiner Debbie Le to discuss the bases for rejection. Applicant's representative would like to thank the Examiners for the courtesy they extended during the telephone interview.

During the interview, Mr. Jankowski asserted that the rejections of Claims 1-16 are improper because, among other reasons, the applied reference, Ortega et al., does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of any pending independent claim. Mr. Jankowski identified the following excerpt of Claim 1 as providing one example of a limitation that is not disclosed or suggested by the applied reference: "evaluating differences between the individual user history scores and the collective user history scores to generate a relative preference profile for the user, wherein the relative preference profile comprises relative preference scores for specific item categories, said relative preference scores reflecting a degree to which the user's predicted affinity for a category differs from the predicted affinity of the user population for that category."

Mr. Jankowski identified the following excerpt of independent Claim 11 as providing one example of a limitation that is not disclosed or suggested by the applied reference: "dividing said total amount of credit by the number of ancestor nodes of the selected item to determine an amount of credit per ancestor to be distributed for the selection event."

The Examiner indicated that he could not respond to the foregoing arguments without reviewing Ortega et al. in further detail. In addition, the Examiner asserted that the pending claims are directed to multiple distinct inventions, and indicated that he would impose a restriction requirement.

Claims 1 and 11 were the primary claims discussed during the interview, although the remaining independent claim was also very briefly discussed. Ortega et al. was the only reference discussed. No exhibits or demonstrations were presented, and no amendments were proposed.